

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION SEVEN

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KASEEN JACKSON et al.,

Defendants and Appellants.

B125364

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA158256)

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR
REHEARING AND MODIFYING
OPINION

THE COURT:

IT IS ORDERED appellant Jackson's petition for rehearing is denied and the opinion filed herein on May 9, 2005 is modified as follows:

1. Throughout the opinion the name Milsap is changed to Millsap.
2. At page 11, footnote 7 new text is inserted at the end of the paragraph to read:

Some amendments were made to the wiretap statutes following the intercepts in this case. (Stats. 2002, ch. 605, § 13.) These amendments, however, do not affect the reasoning in this opinion or the judgment. For ease of reference we will refer to the wiretap statutes as they exist today.

3. At page 39, the text of footnote 114 is stricken and replaced with new text to read:

See *People v. Yeoman* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 93, 114 [appellate court need not examine merits of defendant's claims of error if defendant cannot show prejudice]. Furthermore, it is a long established rule that an appellate court need not "set forth and dispose of, seriatim, each and every item which appellant's counsel chooses to characterize as an 'issue' in the case." (*People v. Ramos* (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 278, 290.) An opinion is not "a brief in reply to the counsel against whose views we decide;" it is a "statement of conclusions, and of the principal reasons which have led us to them." (*Holmes v. Rogers* (1859) 13 Cal. 191, 202, quoted in *Lewis v. Superior Court* (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1232, 1262.)

These modifications do not constitute a change in the judgment.

WOODS, Acting P. J.

ZELON, J.